

Cath Petroskey

From: Fabio Fina <ffina@students.naropa.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 11:31 AM
To: David Mead; Rep. Frank Foster; Cath Petroskey; Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Subject: Wolf Management Plan

Hello,

My name is Fabio, I am 28 years old and currently reside on Linden Ave in Asheville, NC.

It came to my attention that Michigan is currently deciding and the status of wolves and I want to offer a few points for your consideration. These below are taken, and I agree with them, from a local nonprofit called Honor the Earth.

1. We must be careful to ensure the protection of the wolf from adverse effects that could lead to a need for its relisting as a threatened or endangered species.
2. State law-makers should respect and consider the beliefs, concerns and traditional ecological knowledge of its first peoples. The Anishinaabe have special ties to wolves - Ma'iingan. "What happens to Anishinaabe, happens to Ma'iingan, and what happens to Ma'iingan, happens to Anishinaabe," our oral history and teachings advise. We are concerned with the long-term survival of wolves in the state, which is truly believed to signify the fate of our survival.
3. Resolution (KB-1902-2012) was passed by the Keweenaw Bay Tribal Council opposed to any change in the law that allows hunting and/or trapping of the gray wolf in Michigan in order to preserve the ecological balance of predator-prey and protect the sanctity of Ma'iingan for the Anishinaabe.
4. Wolf related conflicts range in severity from perceived conflict (such as visual presence of a wolf) to actual aggressive or predatory behavior (such as witnessed predation of domestic animals on private property). Wolves are not likely to attack any person who does not deliberately incite aggression (by provoking or feeding). Education efforts that increase awareness and understanding should be the number one tool used to minimize wolf-human conflict - much conflict is rooted in stereotypes and misconceptions about the wolf.
5. Where actual threats are identified, the severity, immediacy and frequency of safety threats could guide management responses as already stated in the State of Michigan Wolf Management Plan.
6. There are alternative wolf management opportunities and non-lethal methods that could be used where threat of a wolf warrants action, as opposed to an open hunting season.
Wolves are not eaten, they would be unethically hunted for sport.

Thank you for your attention. This issue is important even to people outside the State of Michigan.
Please consider the impact on a large scale.

Thank you,

Fabio Fina

Cath Petroskey

From: jack parker <jprockdoctor@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 04, 2012 9:06 AM
To: David Mead; Cath Petroskey
Cc: Catherine Parker; Nancy Warren; Jessica Koski
Subject: Re: Michigan Radio: The Environment Report - Debate Continues over Wolf Hunt

Thanks for the article from environmentreport.org "[Debate continues over Michigan wolf hunt](http://environmentreport.org)". I like it and the reasoning behind it.

I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT WE FOLLOW THE GUIDANCE FROM REAL WOLF EXPERTS SUCH AS MESSRS BUMP, PETERSON AND MITCHELL, ALLOWING MR CASPERSON TO GO BACK QUIETLY TO HIS LOGGING TRUCKS. THERE IS OBVIOUSLY NO REASON TO RUSH THE EVALUATION PROCESS IN MICHIGAN.

THE WOLVES BELONG TO THE PEOPLE OF MICHIGAN, ALL OF US, NOT TO A HANDFUL OF WOULD-BE PSEUDO HUNTERS.

Jack Parker, Mining Engineer
Baltic MI 49963

On Tue, Dec 4, 2012 at 7:57 AM, Nancy & Al Warren <nwarren1@earthlink.net> wrote:

<http://environmentreport.org/>

DEBATE CONTINUES OVER MICHIGAN WOLF HUNT



There are an estimated 700 wolves in the state of Michigan. (Photo courtesy of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)

Host: Rebecca Williams
Report date: 12/04/2012

This is the Environment Report. I'm Rebecca Williams.

The Michigan legislature is moving closer to allowing a hunting season for gray wolves. The state Senate voted to designate the wolf as a game species last week. There are around 700 wolves in Michigan, mostly in the western Upper Peninsula.

If the legislature makes the wolf a game species, then wildlife officials will still have to justify that a hunt is necessary and that it won't harm wolf recovery. Bob Allen reports:

Under state law, there can't be a recreational wolf hunt for any old reason.

Wildlife officials would have to show that a hunt is warranted and that it would meet the goal of reducing wolf-human conflicts.

Adam Bump is a wildlife biologist with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

"We've never had a wolf hunt in Michigan. We don't know this is exactly what will happen if we do the following steps."

DNR has a lot of information about wolf numbers, pack sizes and locations.

Wildlife officials also track incidents when wolves attack and kill or wound livestock or pets.

That's referred to as depredation.

But some question whether a hunt is the best way to deal with it.

Jimmie Mitchell is head of Natural Resources for the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians in Manistee.

"The tribes oppose the wolf hunt based on the absence of information related to wise management practices. We don't know whether or not the amount of depredation events that are occurring are enough of a reason to initiate a hunt."

Mitchell speaks on behalf of five tribes that are part of a legal agreement with the state over treaty hunting and fishing rights.

DNR will have to consult with them before a wolf hunt is approved, and if the tribes aren't satisfied there's a good reason for it, they have the option of going back to federal court. (You can learn more in [this recent Environment Report story](#))

Senator Tom Casperson from the Upper Peninsula sponsored the measure to classify wolves as a game animal. He recognizes that the state and private landowners have the authority now to kill wolves that are causing problems.

But he says that still isn't good enough to control the population.

"I think the hunting community plays a key role in helping us get there. And to exclude them from the process, I think is a mistake."

Casperson is hearing from hunters who complain that wolves are killing too many deer. And he points to reports about wolves coming right into people's back yards in the far western U.P.

He says it may make sense just to target a few counties there instead of a full blown hunt.

The Natural Resources Commission decides if there's to be a hunt and what the rules will be, not the legislature.

What researchers do know is that wolves will respond to any decrease in their numbers.

Wildlife biologist Rolf Peterson has studied wolf behavior on Isle Royale for more than 40 years. He says a public hunt could split the animals into smaller packs and actually increase reproduction.

"It's sort of if you kill one wolf, two come to the funeral. I mean that's just a common sense way of expressing the ability of wolves to respond to any sort of increase in mortality."

Peterson says a hunt designed to reduce conflicts with humans could work, depending on what wolves were killed and how many. But he thinks it would have to be in a very small area.

But Peterson says over the last decade trained professionals have shown that they can move in quickly and get rid of problem animals.

"Wolf hunting by the public is not about solving problems, for the most part. It's about people's desire to kill wolves for whatever reason that might be."

The law requires the DNR to manage according to best science that is available to them. And in this case, DNR biologist Adam Bump says, the agency doesn't know for sure how even a targeted hunt would change pack behavior or solve conflicts with humans.

"We can look at a lot of those things. But some of those questions you're just not going to have concrete solid answers for before you move forward."

If a public hunt is approved, he says, the DNR would monitor closely what happens and adapt to changes over time.

For the Environment Report, I'm Bob Allen.

Cath Petroskey

From: jack parker <jprockdoctor@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 10:42 PM
To: David Mead; Cath Petroskey; Jessica Koski
Subject: Fwd: " The 32nd wolf was harvested"- is an intentionally deceptive statement by WDNR.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: jack parker <jprockdoctor@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 3, 2012 at 10:30 PM
Subject: " The 32nd wolf was harvested"- is an intentionally deceptive statement by WDNR.
To: Nancy Warren <nwarren1@earthlink.net>
Cc: Woods Person <woodspersonwis@gmail.com>, Catherine Parker <brinkleycourt@yahoo.com>

Nancy: I've been away for a few days and know that I missed one boat - but could you please insert these thoughts where they can do some good? Please!
Thanks for working so hard to protect Brer Wolf.

Jack

That statement, released by the Wisconsin DNR 12.02.2012, is at best misleading and, more probably, knowingly inaccurate and deceptive.

Consider that a licensed hunter may set more than one trap and that wolves tend to travel in packs - what are the odds that only one wolf will be trapped? If more than one - what might an anti-wolf person do?

Same with the firearms "hunter" - legally carrying a license and a long-range (half-mile?) weapon - who will know where his bullets go? Couldn't he pick off several wolves while watching one of his baitpiles? Especially if he is an avowed anti-wolf person? Some folks shoot for the gut so that the critter will go hide and die. Standard operating procedure. Think about that.

Likewise, isn't it reasonable to expect several trigger-happy deer hunters and rabbit hunters out of thousands in the state to take a potshot at a wolf which crosses their path? "If it's brown - knock it down!" How many?

After all - there is an open season on wolves, isn't there?.

Knowledge of the whereabouts of gamewardens is easily shared today, isn't it? "Bogeyman is headed in your direction buddy."

This is my point: Shouldn't the announcement read "Was reported" instead of "Was harvested" ? Tell us, you statisticians, how many were killed? **You do not know.**

Then shouldn't the numbers game be played accordingly? It is highly unlikely that reported number of killings will be too high.

Another question: What is the meaning of your boilerplate "Social carrying capacity?" Does it represent a consensus from the people of the state, or a loudspeaking minority? We know the answer to that one.

Isn't the predator/prey/habitat relationship the balance for which a conservation agency should strive? That didn't get much press this year, did it?

If the tribes protest by buying licenses and not using them you simply take advantage of those folks by keeping their money and arranging for others to kill the wolves anyway. Right?

As you must know - a black-bear-style lottery with a limited number of licences, equal to the proposed "harvest", would have been more nearly honest than the current hunt regulations, which amount to very pointedly lackadaisical regulation.

Is it OK to feed the deer in winter - and to protect them as "pets" - so that those pets can be shot a few months later?

Seems to me that deer management has gotten out of hand in the last half century - when hunters went into the woods to hunt, to pursue and take game.

... \$

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$...

Methinks it is time to go back to deer management, and wolf management, by people who know how to manage them - definitely not by politicians.

I'm not a violent person but there are times when I think that we need a politician management program, so that the unworthy can be weeded out at least once a year, an open season. July 4th would be appropriate
... We might even balance the budget!

Not being a violent person I would certainly not advocate shooting them at a baitpile, (twenty-dollar bills would work), but might settle for the current, kinder, gentler DNR final-solution they borrow from the ancient Greeks - euthanasia - a good death! Yay! One person - one vote, no money involved. Shysters would look elsewhere for a job. Think about that.

Good night all,

Cousin Jack, Mining Engineer
Baltic, MI 49963

Cath Petroskey

From: Catherine Parker <brinkleycourt@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 8:04 PM
To: David Mead; Rep. Frank Foster
Cc: Cath Petroskey; Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Subject: Comments on pending wolf hunt legislation
Attachments: MI wolf hunt 12-3-12.doc

Please share the attached comments during the Dec. 4 & 5 legislative hearings. I've also reprinted them below.

Thank you!

Good morning, Representatives,

Before you rush ahead with wolf legislation, please consider these comments. There are several reasons why I believe a hunt is both ill-advised and unnecessary for the State of Michigan at this time.

This is a process that should be conducted by wildlife officials, not legislators. We should not follow brashly in Wisconsin's footsteps. If you will not question the propriety or morality of the process that led to a hunt in that state, at least consider the fact that you may be inviting litigation through your actions.

Wolf numbers are not so great that they require "management" by humans. The numbers cited assume that our state is an isolated ecosystem, when in fact, wolf populations in the Midwest should be looked at as a whole. Rad Watkins of the Timber Wolf Alliance suggests that 10,000 individuals might be a genetically viable population. We aren't even close to that number.

Nature will not balance itself if we continually interfere. For example, wolves were nearly exterminated in the lower 48 states, making way for a burgeoning coyote population. As a result, coyotes have been trapped, shot from helicopters, poisoned, and gassed in their dens. This is horrific, in and of itself, and now we want to kill the wolves again?

There are numerous, *nonlethal* means of protecting livestock from wolf depredation, that have been proven to be effective. Among them are electric fences, flagging, and the use of donkeys and dogs bred especially for this purpose.

According to a Michigan State University study, 82 % of Michigan residents place value on having wolves in their home state while only 14 % would buy a license to hunt them. What is the majority's opinion regarding introducing a wolf hunt in our state?

Please do not bow to pressure from influential lobbyists, as Wisconsin did, handing the state a bill designed by politicians. And do try your best to create a culture of ethical hunters, if such a term applies to killing animals for sport. Most of all, remember that, if there is a problem, we have created it by encroaching on the wolves, not vice versa. Respect and humility are in order, and a degree of repentance.

I overheard a conversation recently, between two friends. One of the men was saying that chipmunks were getting into his house, and that he had shot one of them. Rather unexpectedly, the second man asked, "Ray, did you cry?" After a moment of silence, Ray admitted that he had not, and went on to describe a story called "Atonement," about a man who drove cross-country, stopping to bury each dead animal that he found on the road.

Please remember these things as you go forward.

Thank you,

Catherine Parker
322 W. Ohio St.
Marquette, MI

Cath Petroskey

From: Don Coyote <doncoyote99@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 3:42 PM
To: Cath Petroskey; Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Subject: Re: SB 996

Dear Ms. Petroskey and Representative Daley,

I wish to voice my opposition to SB 996, which allows for compensation for missing livestock, with little or no documentation. The approved Wolf Management plan already allows for compensation to producers, at fair market value, for livestock injured or killed by wolves.

Livestock, domestic animals and pets die for many unexplained reasons other than predatory depredation, and can go missing for other reasons than wolves, cougar and coyotes. Therefore, it is critical that a trained specialist investigate any depredation or missing livestock alleged to be caused by these predators. It is equally critical that, as part of the verification process, the owner must allow access to the property if they wish to claim indemnification.

Any legislation must be based on facts, not emotion or fears, and must not be a drain on taxpayers. This bill is not necessary. It will cost the state money we do not have and creates an atmosphere for fraud and deception at taxpayer expense.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George Heritier
14521 Marlow
Oak Park, MI 48237

Cath Petroskey

From: Melba C <Coleman.M@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 3:35 PM
To: Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82); Cath Petroskey; Rep. Cindy Denby (District 47); Rep. Kenneth Kurtz (District 58); Rep. Sharon Tyler (District 78); Rep. Ben Glardon; Rep. Joel Johnson; Rep. Andrea LaFontaine; Rep. Ed McBroom; Rep. Rick Outman; Rep. Bruce Rendon; Rep. Paul Muxlow; Rep. Mike Callton; Rep. Charles Brunner; Rep. Stacy Erwin Oakes (District 95); Rep. Alberta Tinsley Talabi; Rep. Marcia Hovey-Wright; Rep. Kate Segal (District 62); Rep. Charles Smiley
Subject: Testimony Senate Bill 996

Dear Michigan House Agriculture
Committee,
2012

Date: Dec 3,

I believe SB 996 is unnecessary and oppose its passage. It will cost the state money we do not have and creates an atmosphere for fraud and deception at taxpayer expense.

Senate Bill 996 implies that the owner makes his own determination verifies his own loss and isn't even required to submit photos to support the claim. The approved Wolf Management Plan already allows for compensation to producers, at fair market value, for livestock injured or killed by wolves.

Why is this bill necessary? Even with the amendment offered stating that the producer must have had a prior wolf depredation prior to receiving compensation, the bill could still lead to abuse and fraud. Since delisting January 2012, DNR has had the authority to kill wolves involved with depredation. Landowners who have had depredations were also given permits to kill wolves on their land. Further, any producer can kill a wolf, without a permit, if a wolf threatens and/or attacks his livestock. Under SB 996, even with the amendment, a producer may have suffered a past depredation, received compensation and the wolves responsible could be dead, but could still receive additional compensation by claiming he has missing livestock (defined as anything from chicken to captive deer) caused by wolves. A past history of losses by wolves is not conclusive evidence that wolves are responsible for missing livestock, especially considering wolves responsible for depredation can now be killed.

Predators often consume animals that die of natural causes without actually being responsible for their death. It is critical that a trained specialist investigate any depredation or missing livestock alleged to have been caused by wolves, coyotes or cougar. It is equally critical that as part of the verification process the owner must allow access to the property if they wish to claim indemnification.

I asked that you reject Senate Bill 996

Respectfully,

Melba J Coleman
1403 E Maxlow Ave
Hazel Park, MI.48030
248-953-7305

Cath Petroskey

From: JWSnowyPlains@aol.com
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 10:49 AM
To: Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Cc: Cath Petroskey
Subject: Written Testimony - 12/5/12 House Agriculture Committee meeting re: SB 996

From: Jacqueline and James Winkowski, 270 Flodin Road, Gwinn, MI 49841 - 906-249-1011
Please share our following written testimony with the referenced committee.

TO: Michigan House Agriculture Committee

RE: Written Testimony for 12/5 Committee Meeting

Dear Committee:

We are lifelong residents of the Upper Peninsula and strongly oppose SB 996. Please vote NO.

Senate Bill 996 would allow for payment to livestock producers for losses with simply a notarized statement from the owner that, "One or more animals are missing and eligible for indemnification." SB 996 implies that the owner will make his own determination; verify his own alleged predator-caused loss, and is not even required to submit photos to support the claim. This bill at the very least is unnecessary; it will cost our State money and create an atmosphere for fraud and deception at taxpayer expense.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline and James Winkowski, 270 Flodin Road, Gwinn, MI 49841 - 906-249-1011

Cath Petroskey

From: Richard Cussigh <rcussigh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 10:19 AM
To: Cath Petroskey
Subject: Re: On Wolves

Dear Ms. Petroskey:

Following my note please consider the logic in this article:

http://missoulia.com/lifestyles/territory/tracking-science-biologist-s-findings-show-forest-diversity-health-influenced/article_3ec9fc54-c01f-11de-bf16-001cc4c002e0.html

Rick Cussigh

On Sun, Dec 2, 2012 at 9:09 AM, Apple <rcussigh@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Ms. Petroskey:

I was born and raised in Michigan and I love my State. While I live in Chicago now, I spend a great deal of time in the U.P.. In all my years in the woods I think I saw one flash of a wolf passing over a two-track. Seeing a wolf in the Michigan wilds is on my bucket list. Please do not support a hunting season for these animals. Michigan is a beautiful state and its resources should be protected. On the contrary, legislation should be in place to protect resources like wolves and encourage an ecosystem that protects, preserves and enhances the states natural resources. The wolves on Isle Royale are in danger already, don't put the small population of wolves in the rest of the state in the same condition. Our children deserve the opportunity to witness these creatures.

Respectfully,

Richard Cussigh
630-222-8619

--

Richard Cussigh
630-222-8619

Cath Petroskey

From: Apple <rcussigh@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 10:09 AM
To: Cath Petroskey
Subject: On Wolves

Dear Ms. Petroskey:

I was born and raised in Michigan and I love my State. While I live in Chicago now, I spend a great deal of time in the U.P.. In all my years in the woods I think I saw one flash of a wolf passing over a two-track. Seeing a wolf in the Michigan wilds is on my bucket list. Please do not support a hunting season for these animals. Michigan is a beautiful state and its resources should be protected. On the contrary, legislation should be in place to protect resources like wolves and encourage a ecosystem that protects, preserves and enhances the states natural resources. The wolves on Isle Royale are in danger already, don't put the small population of wolves in the rest of the state in the same condition. Our children deserve the opportunity to witness these creatures.

Respectfully,

Richard Cussigh
630-222-8619

Cath Petroskey

From: Jan Hansen <doctorj133@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 10:51 AM
To: Cath Petroskey
Subject: Michigan wolf hunt

I am appalled by the thought of making wolves a game animal. They are majestic, family animals that are an integral part of our food chain. To destroy them is senseless and giving in to the demands of livestock producers. Research has shown that wolves are responsible for only a few percent of livestock deaths. The rest is from overcrowding, cougars, antibiotics, etc. I am a kitchen dealer and use mostly GE and Amana appliances. If this continues, I will be sending emails out to all my fellow dealers to boycott their products. Hope you can help change the tide of this decision. Jan Hansen

Cath Petroskey

From: Leslie Cochran <cochran2@roadrunner.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 1:14 PM
To: Cath Petroskey
Cc: Rep. Frank Foster
Subject: senate bill 1350 and 996

Dear David Mead and Frank Foster,

I am not a Michigan resident, but I am originally from Wisconsin and have had many wonderful trips to Michigan and I use products that originate in Michigan. Please do not let this happen to this beautiful, soulful species - very much unfairly maligned and blamed. Please help work to overturn these bills and not let them become law.

Thank you for your careful consideration to this important issue. Designating the wolf a game species would be a sad moment in your state's history.

Thank you,
Leslie Cochran

Cath Petroskey

From: Janet Hoben <janethoben@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 4:58 PM
To: Cath Petroskey; Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Subject: Wolf "Management" Plan (AKA mass wolf slaughter)

Although I do not reside in Michigan, I do have family there and have visited there. Here in California, we recently welcomed our first wolf (OR7) in nearly 90 years. I am a member of various wildlife centers and groups, including the California Wolf Center.

The National Wolfwatcher Coalition, which I am also a member of, opposes SB 996 and asks that SB 996 be rejected. It is not necessary. The approved Wolf Management Plan already allows for compensation to producers, at fair market value, for livestock injured or killed by wolves.

We do not support compensation for missing livestock, especially considering the weak documentation outlined in Senate Bill 996 which allows for payment with simply a notarized statement from the owner that, "1 or more animals are missing and eligible for indemnification." Senate Bill 996 implies that the owner makes his own determination; verifies his own loss and isn't even required to submit photos to support the claim.

Under SB 996, a producer can receive compensation for missing livestock if there is a history of losses due to the death or injury of livestock from wolves. A past history of losses by wolves is not conclusive evidence that wolves are responsible for missing livestock, especially considering wolves responsible for depredation can now be killed.

Section 6.10.1 of the MI Wolf Management Plan states "...at least 27% of the wolf-depredation complaints submitted by Michigan residents in 2004 were prompted by depredation that were actually caused by dogs or coyotes. Another 23% of the alleged wolf-depredation events reported in 2004 could not be attributed to a specific cause because the available physical evidence was insufficient."

In these cases the producers had a dead/missing animal and still they erroneously blamed the wolf 27% of the time.

Livestock, domestic animals and pets die for many unexplained reasons other than predatory depredation and they can and do go missing for reasons other than wolves, cougar and coyotes. Some missing livestock even return home, unharmed.

Predators often consume animals that die of natural causes without actually being responsible for their death. Larger raptors (great-horned owl, red-tail hawk, bald eagle) have also been known to kill livestock. Eagles have been documented killing lambs and there has even been an occurrence of raven causing problems with new born lamb calves. Therefore, it is critical that a trained specialist investigate any depredation or missing livestock alleged to have been caused by wolves, coyotes or cougar. It is equally critical that as part of the verification process the owner must allow access to the property if they wish to claim indemnification.

Any legislation must be based on facts not emotion or fears and must not be a drain on taxpayers. This bill is not necessary. It will cost the state money we do not have and creates an atmosphere for fraud and deception at taxpayer expense.

The National Wolfwatcher Coalition also opposes SB 1350 and HB 5834. With only 700 wolves in the U.P., the population is still fragile. The need to manage wolves is self created and self justifying and is merely an excuse to kill wolves. Research shows that wolves self-regulate by prey availability and pack interactions.

There is no scientific evidence or peer reviewed research that indicates there is a need for a recreational wolf hunting season in Michigan.

Chapter 6.12.1 of the approved Wolf Management Plan states that reducing wolf numbers in areas with a high density of wolves will be considered when it is determined that problems could not be resolved through non-lethal or individual lethal methods. The plan acknowledges a situation of this type has not occurred in Michigan.

No wolf has threatened or harmed anyone in Michigan. DNR has the authority to remove wolves that have become habituated to people, further minimizing any potential risk to humans.

The MI DNR has the authority to remove wolves responsible for depredation as well as issue landowner permits. Both livestock producers and dog owners have the authority to kill a wolf in the act of attacking their livestock or dog. Livestock producers are compensated for their losses. There is funding available for non-lethal measures to minimize depredations.

There is no evidence that wolves are decimating deer populations. By eliminating the sick, injured, weak, strengthen the deer herd. Research indicates wolves may eliminate diseases such as Chronic Wasting Disease. The penalty for illegally killing a wolf should be elevated to that for illegally killing a moose (\$1000-\$5000).

Human tolerance towards wolves has not improved in any state where wolf hunting is allowed.

--

Janet Hoben, MS, MBA
1724 Peyton Ave #G
Burbank, CA 91504-3646
213-248-8998

Cath Petroskey

From: coolmtnman@verizon.net
Sent: Saturday, December 01, 2012 7:33 PM
To: Cath Petroskey
Subject: killing wolves

The wolf is a rare and beautiful animal and should not be killed.

Orv Lehman Linville VA 540-560-4847

Cath Petroskey

From: Marti Bautel <happyhowls@chartermi.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 10:42 PM
To: Cath Petroskey
Subject: Testimony on SB 996

Testimony on SB 996

Please vote NO on SB 996. This bill is unnecessary as there is already a compensation program in place to pay producers for livestock injured or killed by wolves. As a Michigan taxpayer, I do not support payment for missing livestock presumably caused by wolves, essentially using the producer's self-serving statement.

Martha Ruszkowski
5333 Williamsburg Rd
Williamsburg, MI 49690
231-267-5418

Cath Petroskey

From: Eric Hoyer <ehoyer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 5:30 PM
To: Eric Hoyer
Subject: Please reject SB 996

Please reject SB 996, as this bill is costly to Michigan citizens, likely to result in increased fraud, and falsely can place blame on small populations of native predators such as the gray wolf.

Because such compensation bills should require very close evaluation, which this bill insufficiently requires, it should be utterly rejected.
Only sound governance can be admitted into law, and this bill actually creates opportunity for fraud and falsehood.

Unverified claims by stock owners tend to be 15 to 35 TIMES the actual verified loss to wolves:

US verified cattle losses by rank:

Respiratory problems 26%
Unknown health 18%
Digestive problems 13%
Calving problems 12%
Weather 12%
Diseases 5%
Lameness 4%
Coyotes 3%
Mastitis 2%
Metabolic problems 2%
Domestic dogs 0.6%
Wild felids 0.5%
Theft 0.4%
Wolves 0.2%

I get these approximations through USFWS 2011 of Verified Losses in response to USDA NASS documentation above of UN verified losses. Please explore properly verified livestock losses in Committee and you will find how fraudulent are most claims - MI must NEVER pass laws which allow false blame of natural native predators, such as the Gray Wolf, for what is actually fraud.

Please reject SB 996.

Respectfully,
Eric Hoyer

Cath Petroskey

From: Dotti <dotti2@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 6:45 PM
To: Cath Petroskey
Cc: Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82)
Subject: Bill SB 996 --- Hunting of wolves

Hello,

I am writing this e-mail to voice my opposition to the wolf hunts being voted on Monday. I am a frequent visitor to Michigan and have enjoyed my visits there. Our wolves (and yes, they belong to "we the people") are the apex predator of Nature. They are not for "sport hunting" or a game species. They are an important part of the eco-system and in keeping all of our wildlife healthy. Wolves, unlike humans, only hunt to feed themselves and their families. The second "wolf" bill is to pay ranchers the "fair market value" of any livestock missing. No proof is being required to receive payment. These are two of the most ridiculous bills trying to get passed. I also buy only Amana products and General Motors vehicles but can assure you that if the wolves start being hunted in Michigan I will no longer vacation there or buy anything made in your state. There are many many ways to co-exist with our wolves. The major majority of the American public does NOT want their wolves killed. Only a very very small segment of Americans want this and it seems that they are the ones being catered to. You as employees of "the people" need to hear the majority – not the minority.

Thank you.
Ralph & Dotti Bever
7063 San Sebastian Circle
Boca Raton,
Florida 33433
561.361.4045

Cath Petroskey

From: Michael McLaughlin <briseboy@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 4:30 PM
To: Rep. Kevin Daley (District 82); Cath Petroskey
Subject: Oppose and Reject SB 996

Dear Agriculture Committee Chair,

I am deeply concerned that this bill will result in untrue allegation of predation by a native species vital for healthy wild ecosystems in the Upper Peninsula.

My grandfather is a farmer of Michigan, and his honesty about early mid-20th century farming resulted in our understanding that wolves are not an evil, costly predator, but an important part of Michigan's wild ecosystems.

Please reject SB 996, as this bill is costly to Michigan citizens, likely to result in increased fraud, and falsely can place blame on small populations of native predators such as the gray wolf.

Because such compensation bills should require very close evaluation, which this bill insufficiently requires, it should be utterly rejected. Only sound governance can be admitted into law, and this bill actually creates opportunity for fraud and falsehood.

Here is digest of USDA National Agricultural Loss Statistics

from:

U.S. Department of Agriculture - National Agricultural Statistics Service. 2011a. Cattle Death Loss. <http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/MannUsda/viewDocumentInfo.do?documentID=1625>.

US cattle losses by rank:

Respiratory problems 26%
Unknown health 18%
Digestive problems 13%
Calving problems 12%
Weather 12%
Diseases 5%
Lameness 4%
Coyotes 3%
Mastitis 2%
Metabolic problems 2%
Domestic dogs 0.6%
Wild felids 0.5%
Theft 0.4%
Wolves 0.2%

Unverified claims by stock owners tend to be 15 to 35 TIMES the actual verified loss to wolves.

I get these approximations through USFWS 2011 report of Verified Losses in response to USDA NASS documentation above of UN verified losses. Please explore properly verified livestock loss statistics in Committee and you will find how fraudulent are most claims - MI must NOT pass laws which falsely blame natural native predators such as the Gray Wolf, for what is actually fraud.

Sheep have more problems, but proper nonlethal protections can eliminate almost all predation.

Thank you,
Michael McLaughlin